

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

ARTHUR CHAMBERS,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.) Case No. 16-cv-0541-MJR
VITTORIO GUERRIERO)
GARY CARR)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

REAGAN, Chief District Judge:

Plaintiff Arthur Chambers, an inmate in Lawrence Correctional Center, brings this action for deprivations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is now before the Court for a preliminary review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, which provides:

(a) **Screening**- The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

(b) **Grounds for Dismissal**- On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint-

(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or

(2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

An action or claim is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). Conversely, a complaint is plausible on its face “when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Although the Court is obligated to accept factual allegations as true, *see Smith v. Peters*, 631 F.3d 418, 419 (7th Cir. 2011), some factual allegations may be so sketchy or implausible that they fail to provide sufficient notice of a plaintiff’s claim. *Brooks v. Ross*, 578 F.3d 574, 581 (7th Cir. 2009). Additionally, Courts “should not accept as adequate abstract recitations of the elements of a cause of action or conclusory legal statements.” *Id.* At the same time, however, the factual allegations of a pro se complaint are to be liberally construed. *See Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Serv.*, 577 F.3d 816, 821 (7th Cir. 2009).

Upon careful review of the complaint and any supporting exhibits, the Court finds it appropriate to exercise its authority under § 1915A; this complaint is subject to dismissal.

The Complaint

Plaintiff has brought suit against Vitterio Guerriero and Gary Carr, both doctors at Lawrence County Memorial Hospital. (Doc. 1, p. 1-2). On June 23, 2015, Plaintiff had surgery at Lawrence County to remove his gallbladder. (Doc. 1, p. 5). During the

surgery, Plaintiff's artery was nicked. (Doc. 1, p. 5). Plaintiff's grievance indicates that another surgery was required to stop the bleeding. (Doc. 1, p. 8). Plaintiff alleges that he now suffers from constant pain, irreparable damages, and other symptoms as a result of the doctors' negligence. (Doc. 1, p. 5).

Discussion

Based on the allegations of the complaint, the Court finds it convenient to divide the pro se action into two counts. The parties and the Court will use these designations in all future pleadings and orders, unless otherwise directed by a judicial officer of this Court. However, neither claim survives threshold review.

Count 1 - Deliberate indifference claim against both defendants for nicking Plaintiff's artery during surgery to remove his gallbladder.

Count 2 - State law negligence claim for improperly performing Plaintiff's gallbladder removal surgery.

Count 1 fails for two reasons. A plaintiff cannot proceed with a federal claim under § 1983 against a non-state actor. *See Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan*, 526 U.S. 40, 50 (1999); *Gayman v. Principal Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 311 F.3d 851, 852-53 (7th Cir. 2003). "The traditional definition of acting under color of state law requires that the defendant in a § 1983 action have exercised power 'possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law.'" *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48-49 (1988) (citing *United States v. Classic*, 313 U.S. 299, 326 (1941)). Whether or not either of the defendants, as private physicians, can be considered a "state actor" is a key factor in determining whether Plaintiff can maintain a deliberate

indifference claim against him. *See Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Serv.*, 577 F.3d 816, 822-30 (7th Cir. 2009).

Here, Plaintiff has not alleged that either of the defendant doctors were state actors. He has not alleged that they were “clothed with the authority of state law.” In fact, he has not alleged that they had any ties with state actors at all. This is fatal to his claim against them.

And even if it were not, Plaintiff has not adequately pleaded a claim for deliberate indifference. Prison officials violate the Eighth Amendment’s proscription against “cruel and unusual punishments” if they display deliberate indifference to an inmate’s serious medical needs. *Greeno v. Daley*, 414 F.3d 645, 652-53 (7th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976) (internal quotation marks omitted)). *Accord Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Serv.*, 577 F.3d 816, 828 (7th Cir. 2009) (“Deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of a prisoner constitutes the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain forbidden by the Constitution.”).

To prevail, a prisoner who brings an Eighth Amendment challenge of constitutionally-deficient medical care must satisfy a two-part test. *Arnett v. Webster*, 658 F.3d 742, 750 (7th Cir. 2011). The first prong that must be satisfied is whether the prisoner has shown he has an objectively serious medical need. *Arnett*, 658 F.3d at 750. Only if the objective prong is satisfied is it necessary to analyze the second, subjective prong, which focuses on whether a defendant’s state of mind was sufficiently culpable. *Greeno v. Daley*, 414 F.3d 645, 652-53 (7th Cir. 2005).

But deliberate indifference is not negligence. With respect to the subjective element, the Seventh Circuit has frequently noted that “medical malpractice in the form of an incorrect diagnosis or improper treatment does not state an Eighth Amendment claim.” *Gutierrez v. Peters*, 111 F.3d 1364, 1374 (7th Cir. 1997). *See also Snipes v. DeTella*, 95 F.3d 586, 590 (7th Cir. 1996) (“Mere negligence or even gross negligence does not constitute deliberate indifference.”); *Duckworth v. Ahmad*, 532 F.3d 675, 681 (7th Cir. 2008) (failure to rule out cancer immediately in light of persistent bloody urine may have been malpractice but was not deliberate indifference).

Here Plaintiff’s allegations establish that the doctors were attempting to treat his medical condition at the time of the alleged conduct. In fact, Plaintiff himself uses the word “negligence” several times throughout the course of the complaint. Plaintiff’s factual allegations— that the defendants were performing surgery to remove his gallbladder when they nicked an artery— support an inference of negligence, not deliberate indifference. Plaintiff has not pleaded any facts from which a culpable mental state can be inferred. As Plaintiff has also not leveled this claim against a state actor, **Count 1** must be dismissed with prejudice.

Plaintiff also brings claims of “negligence” against Defendants Guerriero and Carr, based on the same conduct detailed above. A negligence action arises under state law, not federal. Where a district court has original jurisdiction over a civil action such as a § 1983 claim, it also has supplemental jurisdiction over related state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a), so long as the state claims “derive from a common

nucleus of operative fact" with the original federal claims. *Wisconsin v. Ho-Chunk Nation*, 512 F.3d 921, 936 (7th Cir. 2008). "A loose factual connection is generally sufficient." *Houskins v. Sheahan*, 549 F.3d 480, 495 (7th Cir. 2008) (citing *Baer v. First Options of Chicago, Inc.*, 72 F.3d 1294, 1299 (7th Cir. 1995)). While this Court could exercise supplemental jurisdiction over these state-law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337, this is not the end of the matter.

As to **Count 2**, under Illinois law, a Plaintiff "[i]n any action, whether in tort, contract or otherwise, in which the plaintiff seeks damages for injuries or death by reason of medical, hospital, or other healing art malpractice," must file an affidavit along with the complaint, declaring one of the following: 1) that the affiant has consulted and reviewed the facts of the case with a qualified health professional who has reviewed the claim and made a written report that the claim is reasonable and meritorious (and the written report must be attached to the affidavit); 2) that the affiant was unable to obtain such a consultation before the expiration of the statute of limitations, and affiant has not previously voluntarily dismissed an action based on the same claim (and in this case, the required written report shall be filed within 90 days after the filing of the complaint); or 3) that the plaintiff has made a request for records but the respondent has not complied within 60 days of receipt of the request (and in this case the written report shall be filed within 90 days of receipt of the records). *See* 735

ILL. COMP. STAT. §5/2-622(a) (West 2013).¹ A separate affidavit and report shall be filed as to each defendant. *See* 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. §5/2-622(b).

Failure to file the required certificate is grounds for dismissal of the claim. *See* 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. § 5/2-622(g); *Sherrod v. Lingle*, 223 F.3d 605, 613 (7th Cir. 2000). However, whether such dismissal should be with or without prejudice is up to the sound discretion of the court. *Sherrod*, 223 F.3d at 614. In the instant case, Plaintiff has failed to file the necessary affidavit or certificates. Therefore, the claim in Count 2 shall be dismissed. Even if the claim were not deficient, as there are no federal claims that survive threshold review, the Court declines to exercise jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims. This dismissal shall be without prejudice as to Plaintiff's state law negligence claim, so that Plaintiff may re-file the claim in state court, should he secure the necessary affidavits pursuant to 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. §5/2-622.

Pending Motions

As the Court will dismiss this case, Plaintiff's Motion for Recruitment of Counsel is MOOT. (Doc. 3).

Disposition

¹ The August 25, 2005, amendments to a prior version of this statute were held to be unconstitutional in 2010. *Lebron v. Gottlieb Mem. Hosp.*, 930 N.E.2d 895 (Ill. 2010) (Holding P.A. 94-677 to be unconstitutional in its entirety). After *Lebron*, the previous version of the statute continued in effect. *See Hahn v. Walsh*, 686 F. Supp. 2d 829, 832 n.1 (C.D. Ill. 2010). The Illinois legislature re-enacted and amended 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. §5/2-622 effective January 18, 2013 (P.A. 97-1145), to remove any question as to the validity of this section. *See* notes on Validity of 735 ILL. COMP. STAT. §5/2-622 (West 2013).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that COUNT 1 fails to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, and shall be dismissed with prejudice. Further, COUNT 2, shall be dismissed without prejudice, but only as to refiling the claim in state court.

A dismissal without prejudice may count as a strike, so long as the dismissal is made because the action is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim. *See Paul v. Marberry*, 658 F.3d 702 (7th Cir. 2011); *Evans v. Ill. Dep't of Corr.* 150 F.3d 810, 811 (7th Cir. 1998); *Smith v. Veterans Admin.*, 636 F.3d 1306, 1313 (10th Cir. 2011); *O'Neal v. Price*, 531 F.3d 1146, 1154-55 (9th Cir. 2008); *Day v. Maynard*, 200 F.3d 665, 667 (10th Cir. 1999); *Rivera v. Allin*, 144 F.3d 719, 731 (11th Cir. 1998) (abrogated on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199 (2007)); *Patton v. Jefferson Corr. Ctr.*, 136 F.3d 458, 463-64 (5th Cir. 1998). Plaintiff has failed to state any claims that are cognizable in this Court. Plaintiff is advised that this dismissal shall count as one of his allotted "strikes" under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff's obligation to pay the filing fee for this action was incurred at the time the action was filed, thus the filing fee of \$350 remains due and payable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1); *Lucien v. Jockisch*, 133 F.3d 464, 467 (7th Cir. 1998).

If Plaintiff wishes to appeal this dismissal, his notice of appeal must be filed with this Court within thirty days of the entry of judgment. FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(1)(A). A motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* should set forth the issues Plaintiff plans to present on appeal. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 24(a)(1)(C). If Plaintiff does choose to appeal, he will be liable for the \$505.00 appellate filing fee irrespective of the outcome of the

appeal. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 3(e); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *Ammons v. Gerlinger*, 547 F.3d 724, 725-26 (7th Cir. 2008); *Sloan v. Lesza*, 181 F.3d 857, 858-59 (7th Cir. 1999); *Lucien v. Jockisch*, 133 F.3d 464, 467 (7th Cir. 1998). Moreover, if the appeal is found to be nonmeritorious, Plaintiff may also incur another “strike.” A proper and timely motion filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) may toll the 30-day appeal deadline. FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(4). A Rule 59(e) motion must be filed no more than twenty-eight (28) days after the entry of the judgment, and this 28-day deadline cannot be extended.

The Clerk shall **CLOSE THIS CASE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 16, 2016

s/ MICHAEL J. REAGAN
U.S. District Judge